

Description of Appeal to Emotion

Description of Appeal to Consequences of a Belief

_____ “ _____

_____ ”

1. _____

2. _____

[illegible]

“
”
”

Inconsistency

:

Denying the Antecedent

“
”
”

Division

(ii) Germany is a militant country. Thus, each German is militant.

(iii) Conventional bombs did more damage in W.W. II than nuclear bombs. Thus, a conventional bomb is more dangerous than a nuclear bomb. (From Copi, p. 118)

Straw Man

[illegible]

"Senator Jones says that we should not fund the attack submarine program. I disagree entirely. I can't understand why he wants to leave us defenseless like that."

Senator Jones

Bill and Jill are arguing about cleaning out their closets:

Jill: "We should clean out the closets. They are getting a bit messy."

Bill: "Why, we just went through those closets last year. Do we have to clean them out everyday?"

Jill: "I never said anything about cleaning them out every day. You just want to keep all your junk forever, which is just ridiculous."

[illegible]

Irrelevant Conclusion (ignoratio elenchi)

[illegible]

For example, a Christian may begin by saying that he will argue that the teachings of Christianity are undoubtedly true. If he then argues at length that Christianity is of great help to many people, no matter how well he argues he will not have shown that Christian teachings are true.

Begging the Question (petitio principii)

[illegible]

Bill: "God must exist." □□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□

Jill: "How do you know." □□□□□□□□□□□□□□

Bill: "Because the Bible says so." □□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

Jill: "Why should I believe the Bible?" □□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

Bill: "Because the Bible was written by
God." □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ (□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□) □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□ (□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ : □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□
□□□□□□□ : □□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
...□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□... □□□□□□
□□

Figure 1. The relationship between the number of cigarettes smoked per day and the risk of developing lung cancer.

Figure 1 shows the relationship between the number of cigarettes smoked per day and the risk of developing lung cancer. The data is presented in the following table:

Number of cigarettes smoked per day	Risk of developing lung cancer (relative to non-smokers)
0	1.0
1-14	1.1
15-24	1.2
25-34	1.3
35-44	1.4
45-54	1.5
55-64	1.6
65-74	1.7
75-84	1.8
85-94	1.9
95-104	2.0
105-114	2.1
115-124	2.2
125-134	2.3
135-144	2.4
145-154	2.5
155-164	2.6
165-174	2.7
175-184	2.8
185-194	2.9
195-204	3.0
205-214	3.1
215-224	3.2
225-234	3.3
235-244	3.4
245-254	3.5
255-264	3.6
265-274	3.7
275-284	3.8
285-294	3.9
295-304	4.0
305-314	4.1
315-324	4.2
325-334	4.3
335-344	4.4
345-354	4.5
355-364	4.6
365-374	4.7
375-384	4.8
385-394	4.9
395-404	5.0
405-414	5.1
415-424	5.2
425-434	5.3
435-444	5.4
445-454	5.5
455-464	5.6
465-474	5.7
475-484	5.8
485-494	5.9
495-504	6.0
505-514	6.1
515-524	6.2
525-534	6.3
535-544	6.4
545-554	6.5
555-564	6.6
565-574	6.7
575-584	6.8
585-594	6.9
595-604	7.0
605-614	7.1
615-624	7.2
625-634	7.3
635-644	7.4
645-654	7.5
655-664	7.6
665-674	7.7
675-684	7.8
685-694	7.9
695-704	8.0
705-714	8.1
715-724	8.2
725-734	8.3
735-744	8.4
745-754	8.5
755-764	8.6
765-774	8.7
775-784	8.8
785-794	8.9
795-804	9.0
805-814	9.1
815-824	9.2
825-834	9.3
835-844	9.4
845-854	9.5
855-864	9.6
865-874	9.7
875-884	9.8
885-894	9.9
895-904	10.0
905-914	10.1
915-924	10.2
925-934	10.3
935-944	10.4
945-954	10.5
955-964	10.6
965-974	10.7
975-984	10.8
985-994	10.9
995-1004	11.0

Complex Cause

Figure 2. The relationship between the number of cigarettes smoked per day and the risk of developing lung cancer, showing a complex cause.

Wrong Direction

Figure 3. The relationship between the number of cigarettes smoked per day and the risk of developing lung cancer, showing a wrong direction.

Examples:

(i) Cancer causes smoking.

(ii) The increase in AIDS was caused by more sex education. (In fact, the increase in sex education was caused by the spread of AIDS.)

Figure 4. The relationship between the number of cigarettes smoked per day and the risk of developing lung cancer, showing a wrong direction.

Genuine but Insignificant Cause

□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□

Examples:

(i) Smoking is causing air pollution in Edmonton. (True, but the effect of smoking is insignificant compared to the effect of auto exhaust.)

Joint Effect

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□

Examples:

(i) We are experiencing high unemployment which is being caused by a low consumer demand. (In fact, both may be caused by high interest rates.)

Coincidental Correlation (post hoc ergo propter hoc)

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□

Examples:

(i) Immigration to Alberta from Ontario increased. Soon after, the welfare rolls increased. Therefore, the increased immigration caused the increased welfare rolls.

Attacking the Person (argumentum ad hominem)

Appeal to Popularity (argumentum ad populum)

Prejudicial Language

Appeal to Pity (argumentum ad misericordiam)

[illegible][illegible]

Appeal to Force (argumentum ad baculum)

[illegible]

explanation □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□)

- All popes reside at the Vatican.
John Paul II resides at the Vatican.
Therefore, John Paul II is a pope. (□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□)

Arguments with this form are invalid. This is easy to see with the first example. The second example may *seem* like a good argument because the premises and the conclusion are all true, but note that the conclusion's truth isn't guaranteed by the premises' truth.

(□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□
□□
□□
□□
□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□)

- □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□
□□

- □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□

-

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

-

[illegible]

- Argument By Personal Charm

Argument by personal charm is a form of persuasion that relies on the speaker's personal qualities, such as their appearance, personality, or social status, to influence the audience. This type of argument is often used in advertising, politics, and social media to create a positive image and gain support.

- Argument by personal charm is a form of persuasion that relies on the speaker's personal qualities, such as their appearance, personality, or social status, to influence the audience. This type of argument is often used in advertising, politics, and social media to create a positive image and gain support.

- Argument by personal charm is a form of persuasion that relies on the speaker's personal qualities, such as their appearance, personality, or social status, to influence the audience. This type of argument is often used in advertising, politics, and social media to create a positive image and gain support.

- Argument by personal charm is a form of persuasion that relies on the speaker's personal qualities, such as their appearance, personality, or social status, to influence the audience. This type of argument is often used in advertising, politics, and social media to create a positive image and gain support.

- Argument by personal charm is a form of persuasion that relies on the speaker's personal qualities, such as their appearance, personality, or social status, to influence the audience. This type of argument is often used in advertising, politics, and social media to create a positive image and gain support.

- 2014 年 12 月 1 日，公司召开 2014 年第四次临时股东大会，审议通过《关于公司 2014 年度利润分配预案的议案》，决定以 2014 年 12 月 31 日总股本 100,000,000 股为基数，向全体股东每 10 股派发现金股利 1.00 元（含税），共计派发现金股利 10,000,000.00 元。

- 2015 年 4 月 28 日，公司召开 2015 年第一次临时股东大会，审议通过《关于公司 2015 年第一季度利润分配预案的议案》，决定以 2015 年 3 月 31 日总股本 100,000,000 股为基数，向全体股东每 10 股派发现金股利 0.50 元（含税），共计派发现金股利 5,000,000.00 元。2015 年 5 月 15 日，公司完成 2015 年第一季度利润分配工作，实际派发现金股利 5,000,000.00 元。

- 2015 年 12 月 1 日，公司召开 2015 年第四次临时股东大会，审议通过《关于公司 2015 年度利润分配预案的议案》，决定以 2015 年 12 月 31 日总股本 100,000,000 股为基数，向全体股东每 10 股派发现金股利 1.00 元（含税），共计派发现金股利 10,000,000.00 元。

- 2016 年 4 月 28 日，公司召开 2016 年第一次临时股东大会，审议通过《关于公司 2016 年第一季度利润分配预案的议案》，决定以 2016 年 3 月 31 日总股本 100,000,000 股为基数，向全体股东每 10 股派发现金股利 0.50 元（含税），共计派发现金股利 5,000,000.00 元。2016 年 5 月 15 日，公司完成 2016 年第一季度利润分配工作，实际派发现金股利 5,000,000.00 元。

- 2016 年 12 月 1 日，公司召开 2016 年第四次临时股东大会，审议通过《关于公司 2016 年度利润分配预案的议案》，决定以 2016 年 12 月 31 日总股本 100,000,000 股为基数，向全体股东每 10 股派发现金股利 1.00 元（含税），共计派发现金股利 10,000,000.00 元。

- 2017 年 4 月 28 日，公司召开 2017 年第一次临时股东大会，审议通过《关于公司 2017 年第一季度利润分配预案的议案》，决定以 2017 年 3 月 31 日总股本 100,000,000 股为基数，向全体股东每 10 股派发现金股利 0.50 元（含税），共计派发现金股利 5,000,000.00 元。

- [illegible]

[illegible]

Argument from silence

- ...

- 點對點通訊系統中，發送端與接收端之間的通訊信道，其特性是隨時間而變化的，且其變化是隨機的，因此，在設計通訊系統時，必須考慮到這種隨機變化的影響，並採取相應的措施，以保證通訊的可靠性。（having critical points of difference）

- 點對點通訊系統中，發送端與接收端之間的通訊信道，其特性是隨時間而變化的，且其變化是隨機的，因此，在設計通訊系統時，必須考慮到這種隨機變化的影響，並採取相應的措施，以保證通訊的可靠性。A 點對點通訊系統，其發送端與接收端之間的通訊信道，其特性是隨時間而變化的，且其變化是隨機的，因此，在設計通訊系統時，必須考慮到這種隨機變化的影響，並採取相應的措施，以保證通訊的可靠性。B 點對點通訊系統，其發送端與接收端之間的通訊信道，其特性是隨時間而變化的，且其變化是隨機的，因此，在設計通訊系統時，必須考慮到這種隨機變化的影響，並採取相應的措施，以保證通訊的可靠性。A 點對點通訊系統，其發送端與接收端之間的通訊信道，其特性是隨時間而變化的，且其變化是隨機的，因此，在設計通訊系統時，必須考慮到這種隨機變化的影響，並採取相應的措施，以保證通訊的可靠性。B 點對點通訊系統，其發送端與接收端之間的通訊信道，其特性是隨時間而變化的，且其變化是隨機的，因此，在設計通訊系統時，必須考慮到這種隨機變化的影響，並採取相應的措施，以保證通訊的可靠性。A 點對點通訊系統，其發送端與接收端之間的通訊信道，其特性是隨時間而變化的，且其變化是隨機的，因此，在設計通訊系統時，必須考慮到這種隨機變化的影響，並採取相應的措施，以保證通訊的可靠性。

- 點對點通訊系統中，發送端與接收端之間的通訊信道，其特性是隨時間而變化的，且其變化是隨機的，因此，在設計通訊系統時，必須考慮到這種隨機變化的影響，並採取相應的措施，以保證通訊的可靠性。

- 點對點通訊系統中，發送端與接收端之間的通訊信道，其特性是隨時間而變化的，且其變化是隨機的，因此，在設計通訊系統時，必須考慮到這種隨機變化的影響，並採取相應的措施，以保證通訊的可靠性。

- 點對點通訊系統中，發送端與接收端之間的通訊信道，其特性是隨時間而變化的，且其變化是隨機的，因此，在設計通訊系統時，必須考慮到這種隨機變化的影響，並採取相應的措施，以保證通訊的可靠性。

“ ” “ ”

-

-

- 1. primary sources secondary sources. The primary source is the source in which the evidence first appeared. Eyewitness accounts; original documents; and transcripts of speeches as originally delivered are examples of primary sources. Secondary sources are sources that compile, analyze, or summarize primary sources. Secondary sources often provide an

interpretation or a restatement of what was originally said. 3. Quantity

Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied.

- - Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. non sequitor fallacy (“ it does not follow”)

Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied.

Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied.

Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied.

Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. non sequitor fallacy : “ The United States is the only industrialized country in the world where teenage pregnancy *is increasing*. The Guttmacher study found that the U.S. pregnancy rate is twice that of Canada, England, or France, and seven times that of the Netherlands.”

- Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. 1. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. (sharing significant similarities relevant to the conclusion drawn by the arguer) ; 2 . Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied.

Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. 3. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied.

- (Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied.) .

Second, a sufficient number of examples has to be cited (Quantity refers to the number of examples cited to support a claim. A sufficient number of examples is one that is large enough to be representative of the population being studied. 30

□□□ (□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□)

[illegible][illegible]

1. Value claim	2. Policy
----------------	-----------

claim 3. Fact claims

Value claim

[illegible][illegible]

Value

claim

[illegible][illegible]

Claim

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

Five Categories of Claims

Argumentative essays are based on a *claim*, which almost always falls into one of the five following categories.

1. Claims of *fact*. Is it real? Is it a fact? Did it really happen? Is it true? Does it exist?

Examples: Global warming is occurring. Women are just as effective as men in combat. Affirmative action undermines individual achievement. Immigrants are taking away jobs from Americans who need work.

2. Claims of *definition*. What is it? What is it like? How should it be classified? How can it be defined? How do we interpret it? Does its meaning shift in particular contexts?

Examples: Alcoholism is a disease, not a vice. We need to define the term *family* before we can talk about family values. Date rape is a violent crime. The death penalty constitutes "cruel and unusual punishment."

3. Claims of *cause*. How did this happen? What caused it? What led up to this? What are its effects? What will this produce?

Examples: The introduction of the computer into university writing classes has enhanced student writing ability. The popularity of the Internet has led to a rise in plagiarism amongst students. The economic boom of the 1990s was due in large part to the skillful leadership of the executive branch.

4. Claims of *value*. Is it good or bad? Beneficial or harmful? Moral or immoral? Who says so? What do these people value? What value system will be used to judge?

Examples: Doctor-assisted suicide is immoral. Violent computer games are detrimental to children's social development. *The Simpsons* is not a bad show for young people to watch. Dancing is good, clean fun.

5. Claims of *policy*. What should we do? How are we to act? What policy should we take? What course of action should we take to solve this problem?

Examples: We should spend less on the prison systems and more on early intervention programs. Welfare programs should not be dismantled. The state of Oklahoma ought to begin to issue vouchers for parents to use to fund their children's education. Every person in the United States should have access to federally-funded health insurance.

- □□□□□□ :
:

2.

00000000000000000000 00000000000000000000 000000000000
 0000000000000000

00
 0000000000 000
 00000000000000000000000000000000000000 0000 “000000000000
 00000000000000000000000000000000000000 00000000000 00000000000
 00000000000 ” 00
 00000000000000000000000000000000000000 0000000000000000000000
 00000000000000000000000000000000000000 000000000000000000000000
 00000000 000
 00000000000000000000 00
 00000000000000000000 000000000000000000000000000000000000000
 000000 000
 0000000 00
 0000000 00
 00000000000000000000000000000000000000 Appeal to Ignorance 0000000 /
 00
 00000000000000 000 “
 000000000000000000000000000000000000000 00000000000000000000 0000
 000000000000000000 000000000000000000000000000000000000” 0000000
 00000000 000000000000000000 0000000000000000000000000000000000
 0000000000 000
 0000000 “ 000-00000 ” 00000000000000000000 00000000000000
 00000000000000 00000000 000000000000000000000000000000000000

Fallacy: Misleading Vividness

[illegible]

11

[illegible]

[illegible]

-

Fallacy: Red Herring

[illegible]

Fallacy: Slippery Slope

[illegible][illegible]

:

[illegible][illegible]

前提 (premise) と結論 (conclusion) の関係

“前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く” (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く) (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く)

“前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く” (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く) (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く)

前提 (premise) と結論 (conclusion) の関係

前提 (premise) と結論 (conclusion) の関係

“前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く” (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く) (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く)

1. “前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く” (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く) (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く)

2. “前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く” (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く) (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く)

.... 前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く) (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く)

2. 前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く) (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く)

前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く) (前提 (premise) から結論 (conclusion) を導く)

“ 前提が真であるならば結論も真である ” (premise 前提)

“ 前提が偽であるならば結論も偽である ” (premise 前提)

“ 前提が真であるならば結論も真である ” (前提が真ならば結論も真)
conclusion 結論
premise 前提

前提が真ならば conclusion 結論
前提が偽ならば conclusion 結論

“ 前提が真であるならば結論も真である ” (premise 前提)

“ 前提が真であるならば結論も真である ” (premise 前提)

“ 前提が真であるならば結論も真である ” (premise 前提)

“ 前提が真であるならば結論も真である ” (前提が真ならば結論も真)

論理の基礎を学ぶことは、論理的思考能力を鍛錬する上で非常に重要です。本講義では、論理の基礎から応用まで、体系的に学びます。

-----.

“ 論理とは、真実を導くための道具である。論理を用いて、真実を導き出すことが、論理の目的である。 ” (論理の基礎から応用まで、体系的に学びます)

“ 論理とは、真実を導くための道具である。論理を用いて、真実を導き出すことが、論理の目的である。 ” (論理の基礎から応用まで、体系的に学びます)

* 論理とは、真実を導くための道具である。論理を用いて、真実を導き出すことが、論理の目的である。 (conclusion)

論理とは、真実を導くための道具である。論理を用いて、真実を導き出すことが、論理の目的である。 (conclusion)

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

“...-... ”
... “ ...
...
...
...
...
...
...? ” ...
... “ ...
...
...”

...
...
...
...

- ...
... / ...
... / making exception without
evidence

-----.

Analogy ...

Strong analogies will be ones in which the two things we
compare possess relevant similarities and lack relevant
differences.

- 前提 (premise) と結論 (conclusion) の関係
 - 前提 (premise) は結論 (conclusion) を導くための理由となる

[illegible]

本報告係根據本會所屬之「國家發展委員會」及「國家安全委員會」之資料，並參考相關機關、團體、個人之資料及意見，進行分析、研究、整理而成。本報告之內容，除引用相關機關、團體、個人之資料外，其餘均為本會之研究、整理，其內容之真實性、準確性，由本會負責。本報告之內容，除引用相關機關、團體、個人之資料外，其餘均為本會之研究、整理，其內容之真實性、準確性，由本會負責。

False / Weak Analogy

(having critical points of difference)

:

“ Өзбекстан Республикасы Конституциясы - Өзбекстан Республикасы
 Конституциясынын негизинде, Өзбекстан Республикасынын бардык
 укуктары жана эркиндиктери өз ара келип чыгышы менен
 байланышкан жана алардын биринин жоктугу экинчисинин
 жоктугуна алып келет. Өзбекстан Республикасынын бардык
 укуктары жана эркиндиктери - Өзбекстан Республикасынын
 бардык жарандарына жана алардын ар бирине жеткендиктен,
 булардын жоктугу - Өзбекстан Республикасынын бардык
 жарандарына жана алардын ар бирине жеткендиктен.”

□ □ □ □ □ :

[illegible][illegible]

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。

4. 論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 (Rebuttal Principle)

論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 (conclusion) 論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 (premise) 論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 4 論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 (論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 logical fallacy = 論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 60 論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。

-----.

“ 論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 ” (論議の目的は、相手の主張を論理的に破ることにあり、感情的なやり取りは避けるべきである。 premise)

“ $\square p$. $\square(p \rightarrow q)$ ” ($\square p$ is a premise)

“ $\square(p \rightarrow q)$ ” ($\square(p \rightarrow q)$ is a conclusion)

$\square p$ is a premise $\square(p \rightarrow q)$ is a conclusion

=====.

“ $\square p$ ” ($\square p$ is a premise 1)

“ $\square(p \rightarrow q)$ ” ($\square(p \rightarrow q)$ is a premise 2)

“ $\square p$ ” ($\square p$ is a premise 1)

“ ” (premise 2 anecdotal evidence)

“ ” (conclusion)

premise conclusion conclusion

=====.

deductive

"□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ " (premise □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□)

“ 1,400 ” (premise)

“ 1,400
conclusion)

deductive
premise
conclusion
deductive
inductive

_____.

[illegible]

=====

